



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In the Application of:

THOMAS E. BENIM ET AL.

CASE NO.: DP6945 USNA

SERIAL NO.: 09/832,503

GROUP ART UNIT: 1772

FILED: APRIL 11, 2001

EXAMINER: JANE RHEE

FOR: INSULATING LABEL STOCK

1772  
PATENT 4/19/03  
11/18/03

RECEIVED  
NOV 05 2003  
GROUP 1700

**RESPONSE TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2003**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Interview Summary, mailed on September 30, 2003, please consider the following remarks.

**REMARKS**

In the Interview Summary mailed on September 30, 2003, the Examiner stated that the formal written reply to the last Office Action must include the substance of the interview. Applicants' undersigned Attorney (hereinafter "Attorney Hamby") conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner (hereinafter "Examiner Rhee") on September 23, 2003. While Attorney Hamby did not present all of the interview summary at the beginning of the Amendment, and she did not present the summary in one or more paragraphs dealing only with the substance of the interview, she believes she made a bona fide attempt to include the substance of the interview in the Amendment filed on September 26, 2003 by explaining the substance of the interview throughout the Amendment as it related to the particular rejections discussed in the Amendment. See the highlighted portions of the attached copy of the Remarks Section of the Amendment filed on September 26<sup>th</sup>.

Nevertheless, Attorney Hamby provides below a condensed version of the interview of September 23, 2003. First, Attorney Hamby would like to thank Examiner Rhee for taking the time to conduct an interview on September 23, 2003. Although no agreement was reached as to the allowability of the claims, Attorney Hamby believes that the prosecution of the present application was advanced